Document 15

Filed 11/05/24

Page 1 of 6

Case 2:24-cv-02416-DWL

27

28

1

4

Ortiz et al.,

vs.

United States of America et al.,

Defendants.

5

6

7

9

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

2324

25

26 27

28

Plaintiffs,

Case No. CV-24-2417-PHX-JAT
Case No. CV-24-2416-PHX-DWL

** PLAINTIFF(S) CHALLENGES THE CLOSURE OF PLAINTIFFS' CASES BY THE JUDGES WITHOUT JUSTIFICATION **

Judge: Hon. Senior Judge James A Teilborg or Dominic W Lanza

Date: November 6th, 2024

Time: 10:00am

Crtrm.: TBD, No.___, Floor

Complaint Filed: September 13, 2024

Trial Date: TBD

**TO THE HONORABLE COURT: **

I, Rene Ortiz, respectfully submit this challenge under the U.S. Constitution and applicable federal laws, including the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP), specifically Rule 5.1 and others.

I contest the Judge(s) J.A. Teilborg and D. W. Lanza's closure of the Plaintiffs' cases on the grounds of: "...Plaintiff neither paid the filing fee nor moved to proceed in forma pauperis to have the fee waived," and that "...On September 17, 2024, the Court ordered Plaintiff to submit the filing fee or an application to proceed in forma pauperis within 30 days and informed Plaintiff

that failure to comply with that order would result in dismissal without prejudice and without further notice. (Doc. 5.) Plaintiff has not submitted the filing fee or an application to proceed in forma pauperis. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that this action is dismissed without prejudice.

The Clerk of Court shall terminate the action."

This closure is erroneous because the case of **Wairimu v. Dir., Dep't of Homeland Sec.**
states that "no civil action can proceed under these circumstances"—namely, failure to pay a
filing fee or submit a request to proceed in forma pauperis.

On September 13, 2024, I properly filed Grievances with the Clerk of Court in the District Court of Arizona, Tucson which the Grievances were accepted without question(s). However, the Tucson Clerk accepted my Grievances erroneously, assigning incorrect case numbers and Judges. (Which I now question the October 22nd, 2024, Court Hearing to the decision on the selection of a Magistrate Judge or District Judge) It is possible that a filing fee was accepted by the Tucson Court, but now it remains unverified due to the deletion of records related to those erroneous filings. Given this, I respectfully request an investigation into the handling of these matters by the Tucson Court.

I have questions regarding the Court's rationale for closing my cases. On what basis does the Court conclude, (whatever) that I, Rene Ortiz, am a Pro Se/Socio litigant? I am represented as a Private Attorney General under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, and I have representation from several legal entities, including the Department of Veterans Affairs. My

case involves numerous representatives, including Maria Del Socorro Ortiz (Plaintiffs' VA Fiduciary), Phillip A. Talbert, W. Dean Carter, Joseph B. Freh (United States Attorney General) and others.

As a veteran, I cannot be classified as a Pro Se/Socio litigant; thus, I should not be held to the same filing formalities as unrepresented litigants. All my representatives were obligated to ensure compliance with the Court's requests, so the lack of action by them does not constitute a legal rationale for closing my cases.

Moreover, any failure on my part in submitting the required documentation was due to the Clerk of the Court and the Court itself not adhering to their own procedural rules. The incorrect handling of my cases, which included not filing my cases properly, not issuing Summons to the Cases and failing to provide necessary legal documents, resulted in this unfortunate dismissal.

I request a hearing by Special Appearance to address the Court's decision, particularly as it relates to my legal standing and the misunderstandings that ensued. The handling of this matter raises concerns regarding the integrity of the judiciary and the legal responsibilities owed to litigants.

There must be clarity on this issue, and I urge the Court to reconsider its decision, as closing my cases cannot rectify any perceived deficiencies or wrongful acts committed by another party, the Defendants.

It is the Courts' duty to clarify this matter, which the Plaintiff already requested and it was denied unreasonably. If the Court does not want to clarify misunderstanding(s), it should not make hasty, erroneous and illegal decisions on matters it does not understand. The Plaintiff stresses to the Court that the Court cannot assist or favor one litigant over another by presenting technical issues or illegal procedures committed(s) one party or the other, whereby closing cases. Closing Cases by the Court do not absolve the wrongful party of any wrongful or illegal act(s) they committed against the Plaintiff(s). The Defendants violated the Plaintiffs' Rights by not allowing the Plaintiff to peacefully and patriotically participate in the democratic process; and the Court violated the Plaintiffs' Rights to petition the Government for redress of his Grievances, by closing the Cases for (allegedly) not paying the filing nor submitting the paperwork to proceed as Pro Se.

The fact can be said and be entered into the Courts records, that the U.S. Government-The Executive, Judicial, and Legislative Branches, do not respect the Rule of Law, does not respect the U.S. Constitution, does not respect the rights of its' citizens; Does not respect or abide by any moral or social Agreement/Contract the Government has with its citizens/constituents; You all do what pleases You, for your own personal gain, shame on You.

Document 15

Case 2:24-cv-02416-DWL

Page 6 of 6

Filed 11/05/24